The Consumer Z Score™: A Methodology for Auditing Public Reputation Against Government Records

zReports Research Institute

Working Paper · v2026.07 · July 2026

Correspondence: press@zreports.org · https://zreports.org/research

Abstract

Consumer decisions about regulated facilities — child care centers, nursing homes, surgical centers, aviation operators — are overwhelmingly guided by public star ratings and user reviews. These reputation signals, while widely accessible, are opinion-based, subject to solicitation and management by the reviewed entity, and structurally disconnected from the mandatory government records that document licensing, inspection, enforcement, and safety outcomes. This paper describes the Consumer Z Score™, a composite metric that audits an entity's public reputation against its official government record and surfaces divergence between the two. We describe the four-layer data architecture, the ten-point scoring methodology, the records-layer grading system (A–F), and the design principles that maintain analytical independence. The methodology is applied to a database of 166,000+ US facilities across eleven regulated industries. We argue that the systematic divergence between reviews and records — measurable across verticals — represents an information asymmetry harmful to consumer welfare, and that surfacing it requires a methodology distinct from both review aggregation and regulatory reporting.

Keywords: consumer protection, reputation auditing, government records, information asymmetry, facility safety, review integrity, composite scoring

1. Introduction

The modern consumer evaluates regulated service providers primarily through online reviews. A parent choosing a daycare, an adult child selecting a nursing home, and a tourist booking an aviation tour each consult star ratings and user commentary before making decisions with significant safety and welfare implications. Yet these reputation signals are structurally decoupled from the mandatory government records that document the same providers' licensing compliance, inspection outcomes, enforcement actions, complaint dispositions, and — in aviation — accident history.

This decoupling creates a measurable information asymmetry. A child care facility with multiple serious licensing violations may carry a 4.8-star rating across review platforms; an air tour operator with fatal accidents on the NTSB's permanent record may display 5.0 stars. The reviews are not false — they reflect individual experiences as reported by those who chose to

report them. But they are incomplete in a specific, documentable direction: they do not and cannot reflect the government's own findings, which are filed under mandatory reporting regimes the provider cannot influence.

The Consumer Z Score™ is a composite metric designed to surface this asymmetry. Rather than replacing reviews or ignoring them, the methodology audits the review layer against the records layer and flags divergence. A high Z Score indicates agreement between reputation and record; a low score indicates that the public narrative and the official file tell different stories. The metric does not adjudicate which story is true — it flags that two stories exist.

2. Data Architecture

The methodology operates on a four-layer data architecture:

2.1 Layer 1: Source Ingestion

Primary data sources include federal agencies (CMS Provider Data Catalog for Medicare-certified facilities, HHS-OIG Exclusion List for fraud disqualifications, NTSB CAROL for aviation accident records) and state agencies (child care licensing divisions in each covered state, publishing licensing status, inspection findings, enforcement actions, and complaint dispositions). Sources are ingested on the agencies' own republication schedules, ranging from daily (CMS quality measures) to monthly (OIG exclusion list updates).

2.2 Layer 2: The Consumer Records Database™

Raw agency data is normalized into a single record per facility, resolving cross-agency identity (a nursing home appears in CMS, OIG, and state records under different identifiers), temporal alignment (inspection dates across sources), and schema differences (states report licensing deficiencies in heterogeneous formats). The resulting database currently covers 166,000+ facilities across eleven regulated industries: child care, nursing homes, home health agencies, hospice, dialysis centers, ambulatory surgical centers, psychiatric facilities, rehabilitation facilities, air tour operators, skydiving operators, and hot air balloon ride operators.

2.3 Layer 3: The Intelligence Engine

The Intelligence Engine applies the Consumer Z Score™ methodology (Section 3) to each facility record, producing a composite score, a letter grade, and a divergence assessment. Additional outputs include the A-to-Z Check™ (a structured consumer-facing audit of the complete record), risk indicators, and temporal trend signals where historical data permits.

2.4 Layer 4: Publications

Consumer-facing outputs are generated deterministically from Layers 2 and 3: individual facility pages, city and state rankings, research reports and briefs, and the paid Consumer Intelligence Report™ (a narrative synthesis of the record with review-integrity analysis). All publications carry data provenance, database version, government source attribution, and citation format (APA/MLA).

3. Scoring Methodology

The Consumer Z Score™ is a ten-point composite. The full point allocation, input weights, and normalization procedures are proprietary and constitute the Institute's intellectual property. However, the following design principles are disclosed to enable independent evaluation of the methodology's integrity:

Principle 1: Records primacy. Government records receive majority weight in the composite. Review signals are inputs to the divergence assessment, not to the base score. A facility with a perfect review profile and a poor government record will score low, not high.

Principle 2: Fixed rule, no judgment. The free records-layer grade (A–F) is computed from government verdicts alone through one fixed, disclosed rule applied identically to every facility in the database. No human editorial judgment enters the grade. The rule is: the government's own published findings, mapped to a letter scale by severity and recency.

Principle 3: Divergence surfacing. The Z Score's distinctive function is not to rate a facility but to measure the distance between its public reputation (aggregated from review platforms) and its official record (assembled from government sources). A large divergence — high stars, serious findings — is the signal the methodology exists to detect.

Principle 4: Independence. Facilities are never contacted, notified, or given an opportunity to respond before publication. No facility can pay to be listed, delisted, re-scored, or excluded. Revenue derives exclusively from consumer purchases of individual reports. The Institute maintains no business relationship with any facility it evaluates.

Principle 5: Traceability. Every statistic published by the Institute identifies its originating government source, database version, and computation date. Publications carry APA and MLA citation formats to facilitate academic and journalistic reference.

4. The Records-Layer Grade

The free, publicly visible grade (A through F) is derived solely from Layer 1 government records and contains no Intelligence Engine scoring or review-signal analysis. It maps the government's own published verdicts — licensing status, inspection deficiency counts and severity, enforcement actions, penalty assessments, complaint substantiations, and (in aviation) accident records — through a fixed rubric. The rubric is identical across all facilities within a vertical and is published in full at zreports.org/methodology.

The grade is intentionally separated from the Z Score to maintain a clean distinction between what the government says (the grade) and what the divergence between government and public reputation reveals (the score). Consumers who access only the free tier receive the government's own assessment, transparently mapped. Consumers who purchase the full report receive the composite analysis.

5. Limitations and Scope

The methodology has several structural limitations the Institute discloses by design:

Agency coverage gaps. Government records reflect only what agencies inspect, investigate, and publish. Facilities in jurisdictions with less frequent inspection cycles will present thinner records, producing grades that reflect the reporting regime as much as the facility's true compliance.

Temporal depth. Some state licensing files provide only current-cycle data; historical depth varies by source. The methodology weights recency but cannot manufacture history that agencies do not publish.

License-exempt entities. Certain facility types (e.g., small home-based child care below a state's licensing threshold, church-operated programs with statutory exemptions) do not appear on licensing registers and therefore are not in the database. The absence of a facility from the database should not be interpreted as a negative signal.

Review-signal quality. The divergence assessment depends on review data gathered from public platforms. Review volume, authenticity, and representativeness vary by facility and platform. The methodology audits reviews against records; it does not independently verify the authenticity of individual reviews.

6. Conclusion

The Consumer Z Score™ methodology addresses a specific, measurable gap in consumer decision-making: the disconnect between publicly visible reputation signals and mandatory government records for regulated facilities. By systematically surfacing divergence rather than replacing either signal, the methodology serves a function that neither review platforms nor government portals currently perform. The Institute publishes this working paper to enable evaluation of the methodology's design principles and to invite scrutiny proportional to the trust consumers are asked to place in its outputs.

References

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. (n.d.). Provider Data Catalog. data.cms.gov/provider-data/

HHS Office of Inspector General. (n.d.). Exclusions Program (LEIE). oig.hhs.gov/exclusions/

National Transportation Safety Board. (n.d.). CAROL Query — Aviation Accident Database. carol.ntsb.gov/

49 C.F.R. Part 830 — Notification and Reporting of Aircraft Accidents or Incidents.

FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018, Pub. L. 115-254, 132 Stat. 3186.

zReports Research Institute. (2026). Published methodology. zreports.org/methodology

© 2026 zReports Research Institute · zreports.org/research · press@zreports.org